arXiv:1402.5843v1 [cs.FL] 24 Feb 2014

Cyclic Complexity of Words

Julien Cassaigne[1], Gabriele Fici[2], Marinella Sciortino[2], and Luca Q. Zamboni[3,4]

[1] Institut de Mathématiques de Luminy, Marseille, France
cassaigne@iml.univ-mrs.fr
[2] Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, University of Palermo, Italy
{fici,mari}@math.unipa.it
[3] Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, France
[4] Department of Mathematics, University of Turku, Finland
lupastis@gmail.com

Abstract. We introduce and study a new complexity function on words, that we call *cyclic complexity*, which counts the number of conjugacy classes of factors of each given length. We extend the famous Morse-Hedlund theorem to the setting of cyclic complexity by showing that a word is ultimately periodic if and only if it has bounded cyclic complexity. Unlike most complexity functions, cyclic complexity distinguishes between Sturmian words having different slopes. More precisely, we prove that if x is a Sturmian word and y is a word having the same cyclic complexity of x, then y is Sturmian and, up to renaming letters, has the same language of factors of x.

Keywords: Cyclic complexity, factor complexity, Sturmian words, minimal forbidden factor.

1 Introduction

The usual notion of complexity of a discrete system counts the number of distinct patterns of a same size that the system can generate. In the case of sequences (words), this is the number of distinct blocks (factors) of each given length. This measure of complexity is usually called *factor complexity* (or *block complexity*). The words with the "simplest" structure are the periodic ones. They are of the form $x = u^\omega$ (i.e., an infinite concatenation of a same finite block u) called *purely periodic*, or of the form $x = vu^\omega$, called *ultimately periodic*. The non-periodic words are called *aperiodic*. The factor complexity distinguishes between periodic and aperiodic words. In fact, a fundamental result dating back to the late 30's is the famous theorem of Morse and Hedlund [14] stating that a word is aperiodic if and only if it has at least $n+1$ factors of length n for every n. From this result, it is natural to consider those aperiodic words which have minimal factor complexity, i.e., those having exactly $n + 1$ distinct factors of length n for every n. These are called *Sturmian words*, and a vast bibliography exists showing their interest both from the theoretical viewpoint and in applications. For example, Sturmian

words code the digital approximations in the plane of Euclidean straight lines with irrational slope, with the property that two Sturmian words have the same slope if and only if they have the same language of factors.

There exist many other measures of complexity of words in literature. For example, a lot of attention has recently been given (see for instance [3,10,16,18,19]) to the *abelian complexity*, that is the function counting the number of factors of each given length up to permutations. Other new measures of complexity of words have been introduced over the time, which are intermediate between factor and abelian complexity (e.g. maximal pattern complexity [7], k-abelian complexity [8], binomial complexity [17]) or involve different definitions that appear naturally in the study of sequences (e.g. periodicity complexity [12], minimal forbidden factor complexity [13], palindromic complexity [5], etc.) For most of these measures, Sturmian words are those aperiodic words of lowest complexity. However, they do not distinguish between two Sturmian words having different slopes.

In this paper, we propose a new measure of complexity, *cyclic complexity*, which consists in counting the factors of each given length of a word up to conjugacy. The notion of conjugacy is a basic notion in Combinatorics on Words. Two words are said conjugate if they are equal when read on a circle[5]. That is, the cyclic complexity of a word is the function counting the number of conjugacy classes of factors of each given length.

One of the main results of this paper is that cyclic complexity distinguishes between periodic and aperiodic words. In fact, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *A word is ultimately periodic if and only if it has bounded cyclic complexity.*

That is, the Morse-Hedlund theorem can be extended to the setting of cyclic complexity. Note that a word is (purely) periodic if and only if there exists an integer n such that all the factors of length n are conjugate. Therefore, the minimum value that the cyclic complexity of an aperiodic word can take is 2. Actually, we will prove that Sturmian words have the property that the cyclic complexity takes value 2 infinitely often.

Since the Sturmian words are characterized by having $n+1$ factors of length n for every n, the factor complexity does not distinguish between two Sturmian words with different languages of factors. In contrast, for cyclic complexity, two Sturmian words with different languages of factors have different cyclic complexity. Indeed, we prove something stronger:

Theorem 2. *Let x be a Sturmian word. If a word y has the same cyclic complexity as x, then, up to renaming letters, y is a Sturmian word having the same slope of x.*

That is, not only two Sturmian words with different languages of factors cannot have the same cyclic complexity, but the only words which have the

[5] More formally, u and v are conjugate if and only if one can write $u = w_1w_2$ and $v = w_2w_1$ for some words w_1, w_2.

same cyclic complexity of a Sturmian word x are those Sturmian words with the same slope of x.

These two results suggest that cyclic complexity can be considered as an interesting refinement of the classical notion of factor complexity, and can open new perspectives in the study of complexity of discrete systems.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give basic definitions and introduce cyclic complexity. In Section 3 we discuss Theorem 1 and give a skecth of its proof, while in Section 4 we focus on Sturmian words and discuss Theorem 2, along with a sketched proof. Finally, in Section 5 we discuss conclusions and future directions of development.

2 Basics

Given a finite non-empty ordered set A (called the *alphabet*), we denote by A^*, and $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ respectively the set of finite words and the set of (right) infinite words over the alphabet A. The order on the alphabet A extends in a natural way to the set A^* and we refer to this latter as to the *lexicographic order*.

Given a finite word $w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n$ with $n \geq 1$ and $w_i \in A$, we denote the length n of w by $|w|$. The *empty word* will be denoted by ε and we set $|\varepsilon| = 0$. We denote by A^n the set of words of length n and by A^+ the set of non-empty words. For $u, v \in A^+$ we denote by $|u|_v$ the number of occurrences of v in u. For instance $|0110010|_{01} = 2$. The *Parikh vector* of w is the vector whose components are the number of occurrences of the letters of A in w. For example, if $A = \{a, b, c\}$, then the Parikh vector of $w = abb$ is $(1, 2, 0)$.

The *reverse* (or *mirror image*) of a finite word w is the word obtained by reading w in the reverse order.

Given a finite or infinite word $\omega = \omega_1 \omega_2 \cdots$ with $\omega_i \in A$, we say a word $u \in A^+$ is a *factor* of ω if $u = \omega_i \omega_{i+1} \cdots \omega_{i+n-1}$ for some positive numbers i and n. We denote by $\mathrm{Fac}(\omega)$ the set of all factors of ω, and by $\mathrm{Alph}(\omega)$ the set of all factors of ω of length 1. If $w = uv$, we say that the factor u is a *prefix* of w, while the factor v is a *suffix* of w.

A factor u of ω is called *right special* if both ua and ub are factors of ω for some pair of distinct letters $a, b \in A$. Similarly, u is called *left special* if both au and bu are factors of ω for some pair of distinct letters $a, b \in A$. The factor u is called *bispecial* if it is both right special and left special.

For each factor u of ω, we set

$$\omega\big|_u = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \omega_n \omega_{n+1} \cdots \omega_{n+|u|-1} = u\}.$$

We say ω is *recurrent* if for every $u \in \mathrm{Fac}(\omega)$ the set $\omega\big|_u$ is infinite. We say ω is *uniformly recurrent* if for every $u \in \mathrm{Fac}(\omega)$ the set $\omega\big|_u$ is syndedic, i.e., of bounded gap. A word $\omega \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$ is *(purely) periodic* if there exists a positive integer p such that $\omega_{i+p} = \omega_i$ for all indices i, and it is *ultimately periodic* if $\omega_{i+p} = \omega_i$ for all sufficiently large i. Finally, a word $\omega \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$ is called *aperiodic* if it is not

ultimately periodic. For a finite word $w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n$, we call p a *period* of u if $w_{i+p} = w_i$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n - p$.

Two finite or infinite words are said to be *isomorphic* if the two words are equal up to a renaming of the letters.

A (finite or infinite) word w over A is *balanced* if and only if for any u, v factors of w of the same length, and for every letter $a \in A$, one has $||u|_a - |v|_a| \leq 1$.

More generally, w is *C-balanced* if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any u, v factors of w of the same length, and for every letter $a \in A$, one has $||u|_a - |v|_a| \leq C$. For example, the word 010111 is not balanced, but it is 2-balanced. Note that if w is C-balanced, then it is C'-balanced for any $C' \geq C$.

The *factor complexity* of an infinite word ω is the function

$$p_\omega(n) = |\mathrm{Fac}(\omega) \cap A^n|,$$

i.e., the function that counts the number of distinct factors of length n of ω, for every $n \geq 0$.

Recall that two finite words u, v are *conjugate* if there exist words w_1, w_2 such that $u = w_1 w_2$ and $v = w_2 w_1$. The conjugacy relation is an equivalence over A^*, that we denote by $\sim$, whose classes are called *conjugacy classes*. Note that two words belonging to the same conjugacy class must have the same Parikh vector.

We now introduce a new measure of complexity. The *cyclic complexity* of an infinite word ω is the function

$$c_\omega(n) = \left| \frac{\mathrm{Fac}(\omega) \cap A^n}{\sim} \right|,$$

i.e., the function that counts the number of distinct conjugacy classes of factors of length n of ω, for every $n \geq 0$.

Observe that, by the definition, $c_\omega(n) \leq p_\omega(n)$ for every n. Moreover, if a word ω has maximal cyclic complexity, then it has maximal factor complexity. In fact, let $w \in A^*$ be any word. We want to show that $w \in \mathrm{Fac}(\omega)$. Consider the word ww. From the maximality of the cyclic complexity of ω, some conjugate of ww is an element of $\mathrm{Fac}(\omega)$. But every conjugate of ww contains w as a factor, and therefore $w \in \mathrm{Fac}(\omega)$.

It is clear that if two languages are isomorphic, then they have the same cyclic complexity. Furthermore, if L is a language, and L' is obtained from L by reversing (mirror image) each word in L, then L and L' have the same cyclic complexity.

3 Cyclic complexity distinguishes between periodic and aperiodic words

In this section we discuss Theorem 1, and give a sketch of its proof.

The following lemma relates the cyclic complexity to balancedness.

Lemma 1. *Let $\omega \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$ and suppose that there exists a constant C such that $c_\omega(n) \leq C$ for every n. Then ω is C-balanced.*

Proof. For every n, there are at most C conjugacy classes of factors of length n in ω. This implies that there are at most C different Parikh vectors for the factors of ω of length n, that is, ω has abelian complexity bounded by C. It can be proved (see [16]) that this implies that the word ω is C-balanced. □

The next lemma relates the factor complexity to bispecial factors and minimal forbidden factors.

Lemma 2. *Let ω be an infinite word with linear factor complexity. Then there exist infinitely many minimal forbidden factors for ω.*

We now give a sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1 (Sketch). If ω is ultimately periodic, then it has bounded factor complexity by Morse-Hedlund theorem, and therefore it must have bounded cyclic complexity.

Conversely, assume that the cyclic complexity of ω is bounded by a constant C and that, by contradiction, the word ω is aperiodic. Then this implies that ω is C-balanced (Lemma 1). From C-balancedness and aperiodicity we have that ω has linear factor complexity. Moreover, from C-balancedness we have that, up to removing a prefix v, there exists an integer N such that every letter of $\mathrm{Alph}(\omega)\backslash\mathrm{Alph}(v)$ occurs in every factor of ω of length N. From linear complexity, we have that there exist infinitely many minimal forbidden factors (Lemma 2). Now, take a set of minimal forbidden factors of cardinality greater than $C \cdot N$. For each minimal forbidden factor av, where $|a| = 1$, there is an occurrence of v in ω. In any interval of length N there is an integer n and a factor of length n starting with v and ending with a. Since we have more than CN such factors, there are at least $C+1$ of them with the same length. They cannot be conjugate since if by contradiction u_1v_1 and u_2v_2 were factors of two conjugate words w_1 and w_2 resp., then either u_1v_2 would occur in w_2 or u_2v_2 would occur in w_1. This proves that there are at least $C + 1$ many different conjugacy classes, a contradiction. □

4 Cyclic complexity distinguishes between Sturmian words with different languages

In this section we give results on the cyclic complexity of Sturmian words, and give a sketch of the proof of Theorem 2.

A *Sturmian word* is an infinite word that has exactly $n + 1$ distinct factors of length n, for every $n \geq 0$. That is, a word x is Sturmian if and only if $p_x(n) = n + 1$ for every $n \geq 0$. Note that an immediate consequence of the definition is that $|\mathrm{Alph}(x)| = 2$, so a Sturmian word is a binary word. In this section we fix the alphabet $A = \{0, 1\}$.

By Morse-Hedlund Theorem, Sturmian words are the aperiodic words with minimal factor complexity.

A very well known instance of Sturmian words is the Fibonacci word $F = 01001010010010100101001010\cdots$

Sturmian words have a multitude of combinatorial properties that make them fundamental objects in the field of Combinatorics on Words. We recall some of them in the next proposition.

Proposition 1. *Let $x \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *x is Sturmian;*
2. *x is balanced and aperiodic;*
3. *x has exactly one right (resp. left) special factor for each length.*

There exists a vast bibliography on Sturmian words (see for instance the survey papers [1, 2], [9, Chap. 2], [15, Chap. 6] and references therein).

Recall that the *slope* of a finite binary word w over the alphabet A is defined as $s(w) = \frac{|w|_1}{|w|}$. The slope of an infinite binary word, when it exists, is the limit of the slopes of its prefixes. A Sturmian word can be also defined by considering the intersections with a squared-lattice of a semi-line having a slope which is an irrational number. A horizontal intersection is denoted by the letter 0, while a vertical intersection is denoted by the letter 1. Note that the slope of the Sturmian word is exactly the slope of such a semi-line. For example, the slope of the Fibonacci word is $(1 + \phi)^{-1}$, where $\phi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ is the golden ratio.

An important property of Sturmian words is that their set of factors depends on their slope only, i.e., we have the following result (see [14]).

Proposition 2. *Let x, y be two Sturmian words. Then $Fac(x) = Fac(y)$ if and only if x and y have the same slope.*

A fundamental role in the study of factors of Sturmian words is played by the *central words*. A word is central if it has coprime periods p and q and length $p + q - 2$. There are several characterizations of central words (see [1] for a survey). Here we recall the following ones.

Proposition 3. *Let w be a word over A. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *w is a central word;*
2. *$0w1$ and $1w0$ are conjugate;*
3. *w is a bispecial factor of some Sturmian word;*
4. *w is a palindrome and the words $w0$ and $w1$ are balanced;*
5. *$0w1$ is balanced and is the least element (w.r.t. the lexicographic order) in its conjugacy class;*
6. *w is a power of a letter or there exist central words p_1, p_2 such that $w = p_1 01 p_2 = p_2 10 p_1$. Moreover, in this latter case $|p_1| + 2$ and $|p_2| + 2$ are coprime periods of w, and $\min(|p_1| + 2, |p_2| + 2)$ is the minimal period of w.*

Let w be a central word with coprime periods p and q and length $p+q-2$. The words $0w1$ and $1w0$, that by Proposition 3 are conjugate, are called *Christoffel words*. Let $r = |0w1|_0$ and $s = |0w1|_1$. It can be proved that r and s are the multiplicative inverses of p and q modulo $p+q$. Moreover, the conjugacy class of $0w1$ and $1w0$ contains exactly $|w|+2$ elements. If we sort these words lexicographically and arrange them as rows of a matrix, we obtain a square matrix with remarkable combinatorial properties (see [4, 6, 11]). We call this matrix the (r,s)-*Christoffel array* and denote it by $\mathcal{A}_{r,s}$ (see Figure 1 for an example). Two consecutive rows of $\mathcal{A}_{r,s}$ differ only by a swap of two consecutive positions. Moreover, the columns are also conjugate, and in particular the first one is 0^r1^s, while the last one is 1^s0^r.

Every aperiodic word (and therefore, in particular, every Sturmian word) contains infinitely many bispecial factors. If w is a bispecial factor of a Sturmian word x, then w is central by Proposition 3, and there exists a unique letter $a \in A$ such that w', the shortest palindrome beginning with wa, is a bispecial factor of x. Moreover, if p and q are the coprime periods of w such that $|w| = p+q-2$, then the word w' is central and its coprime periods p' and q' such that $|w'| = p'+q'-2$ satisfy either $p' = p+q$ and $q' = p$, or $p' = p+q$ and $q' = q$, depending on the letter a. For example, 010 is a bispecial factor of the Fibonacci word F, and has coprime periods 3 and 2 (and length $3+2-2$). The next bispecial factor of F (in length order) is 010010, which is the shortest palindrome beginning with $010 \cdot 0$, and has coprime periods 5 and 3 (and length $5+3-2$). There exist other Sturmian words having 010 as a bispecial factor and for which the next bispecial factor is 01010 (i.e., the shortest palindrome beginning with $010 \cdot 1$) whose coprime periods are 5 and 2.

These combinatorial properties of central words and the bispecial factors of a Sturmian word will be needed in our proof of Theorem 2.

Sturmian words have unbounded cyclic complexity (by Theorem 1) but their cyclic complexity takes value 2 for infinitely many n. More precisely, we have the following result.

Lemma 3. *Let x be a Sturmian word. Then $c_x(n) = 2$ if and only if $n = 1$ or there exists a bispecial factor of x of length $n-2$.*

The value 2 is the minimal possible for an aperiodic word. In fact, it is well known that a word ω is (purely) periodic if and only if there exists $n \geq 1$ such that all the factors of length n of ω are conjugate.

Since a Sturmian word contains infinitely many bispecial factors, the previous result implies that for a Sturmian word x one has that $\liminf c_x(n) = 2$. However, this is not a characterization of Sturmian words. In fact, there exist non-Sturmian aperiodic words with minimal cyclic complexity (in the sense of having limit inferior of the cyclic complexity equal to 2). Consider for example the morphism $\mu : 0 \mapsto 00, 1 \mapsto 01$. It is possible to prove that in the word $\mu(F) = 00010000010001000001\cdots$, image of the Fibonacci word F under μ, there are exactly two conjugacy classes of factors of length n for every n such that $n = 2F_k$ for some k, so that $\liminf c_{\mu(F)}(n) = 2$. However, the word $\mu(F)$

is not Sturmian (it contains the factors 00000 and 10001 and therefore is not balanced). We show in Table 1 the first values of the cyclic complexity of F and $\mu(F)$.

n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
$c_F(n)$	2	2	2	3	2	4	4	2	7	4	5	8	2	9	9	4	13	5	9	14	2	16
$c_{\mu(F)}(n)$	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	5	4	5	4	6	2	7	7	7	4	9	5

Table 1. The initial values of the cyclic complexity of the Fibonacci word F and of its morphic image $\mu(F)$.

We now give a sketch of the proof of Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2 (Skecth). Since y has the same cyclic complexity of x, we have that in particular $2 = c_x(1) = c_y(1)$, so y is a binary word. Since x is aperiodic, then by Theorem 1, c_x is unbounded. Since x and y have the same cyclic complexity, always by Theorem 1 we have that y is aperiodic.

We want to prove that y and x have the same factors. By contradiction, let $n+2$ be the least integer such that x and y have different factors. This implies that x and y have a same bispecial factor w of length n. Let p' and q', with $p' > q'$, be the two coprime periods of w such that $n = |w| = p' + q' - 2$. Let w_x and w_y the next bispecial factors of x and y respectively. It can be proved that $\{|w_x|, |w_y|\} = \{2p' + q' - 2, p' + 2q' - 2\}$, and that w_x and w_y cannot have the same length.

Suppose $|w_x| < |w_y|$. Then, by Lemma 3, y would have cyclic complexity equal to 2 at length $|w_x| + 2$, which is impossible since between $|w|$ and $|w_y|$ the word y behaves as a Sturmian word and so by Lemma 3 it should have a bispecial factor of length $|w_x| + 2$. Hence we can suppose that $|w_x| > |w_y|$, so that w_x has periods $p' + q'$ and p', and length $2p' + q' - 2$, while w_y has periods $p' + q'$ and q', and length $p' + 2q' - 2$.

To ease notation, we set $p = p' + q'$ and $q = p'$, so that $|w_y| = 2p - q - 2$ and $|w_x| = p + q - 2$. Let us consider the set of factors of y of length $2p - q$. Since $|w| + 2 < 2p - q < |w_x| + 2$, we know by Lemma 3 that $c_x(2p - q) > 2$. So $c_y(2p - q) > 2$.

If there was a Sturmian word y' such that $\mathrm{Fac}(y') \cap A^{2p-q} = \mathrm{Fac}(y) \cap A^{2p-q}$, then $2p - q$ would be the length of a bispecial factor plus 2 of a Sturmian word, and then, by Lemma 3, we would have $c_y(2p - q) = 2$, a contradiction. This implies that w_y is a bispecial factor of y that behaves differently from a bispecial factor of a Sturmian word. More precisely, we must have that $0w_y$ and $1w_y$ are both right special factors of y. Therefore, $0w_y0$ and $1w_y1$ are in two different conjugacy classes and all the other factors of y of length $2p - q$ are in a third conjugacy class. In other words, we have $c_y(2p - q) = 3$. Thus, in order to have a contradiction we are left to prove that $c_x(2p - q) \geq 4$.

It is known that among the $p+q+1$ factors of x of length $p+q$, there is one factor with a Parikh vector and the remaining $p+q$ factors with the other Parikh vector, and these latter are in a same conjugacy class, which is in fact the conjugacy class of the Christoffel word $0w_x1$. Let $r = |0w_x1|_0$ and $s = |0w_x1|_1$. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that $r > s$, i.e., that 11 does not appear as a factor in x. Therefore, we can build the (r,s)-Christoffel array $\mathcal{A}_{r,s}$.

The factors of length $2p-q$ of x can be obtained by removing the last $2q-p$ columns from $\mathcal{A}_{r,s}$ (of course, in this way some rows can be equal and therefore some factors appear more than once). We refer to the matrix so obtained as to ${\mathcal{A}'}_{r,s}$.

The cases $s = 1, 2, 3$ can be proved separately. Here we give the sketch of the proof when $s > 3$.

Recall that $\{r, s\} = \{p^{-1}, q^{-1}\} \mod (p+q)$. Suppose that $s = p^{-1} < q^{-1}$. In this case, one can prove that the last three rows in ${\mathcal{A}'}_{r,s}$ are distinct and start and end with 1, and therefore each of these rows is unique in its conjugacy class. Since any other row correspond to a factor with a different Parikh vector, this implies that there are at least 4 conjugacy classes and we are done.

The other case is when $s = q^{-1} < p^{-1}$. This case can be proved analogously by considering the first four rows of the matrix ${\mathcal{A}'}_{r,s}$. In fact, one can prove that the factors appearing in the first four rows of the matrix ${\mathcal{A}'}_{r,s}$ are pairwise distinct and neither is conjugate to another. □

Example 1. Consider the Fibonacci word F and its bispecial factor $w = 010010$, which has periods $p = 5$ and $q = 3$. We have $s = q^{-1} = 3 < 5 = r = p^{-1}$. In Figure 1 we show the $(5,3)$-Christoffel array $\mathcal{A}_{5,3}$. The rows are the lexicographically sorted factors of F with Parikh vector $(5,3)$. The other factor of length 8 of F is 10100101. The factors of F of length $2p-q = 7$ can be obtained by removing the last column of the matrix. Notice that the first 4 rows (once the last character has been removed) are pairwise distinct and neither is conjugate to another.

$$\mathcal{A}_{5,3} = \begin{pmatrix} 0&0&1&0&0&1&0&1 \\ 0&0&1&0&1&0&0&1 \\ 0&1&0&0&1&0&0&1 \\ 0&1&0&0&1&0&1&0 \\ 0&1&0&1&0&0&1&0 \\ 1&0&0&1&0&0&1&0 \\ 1&0&0&1&0&1&0&0 \\ 1&0&1&0&0&1&0&0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Fig. 1. The matrix $\mathcal{A}_{5,3}$ for the Fibonacci word F for $p = 5$ and $q = 3$.

To end this section, we compare cyclic complexity to another known measure of complexity, the minimal forbidden factor complexity.

Let w be a (finite or infinite) word over an alphabet A. A finite non-empty word v is a *minimal forbidden factor* for w if v does not belong to $\mathrm{Fac}(w)$ but every proper factor of v does.

We denote by $\mathrm{MF}(w)$ the set of all minimal forbidden words for w. The *minimal forbidden factor complexity* of an infinite word ω is the function

$$mf_\omega(n) = |\mathrm{MF}(\omega) \cap A^n|\,,$$

i.e., the function that counts the number of distinct minimal forbidden factors of length n of ω, for every $n \geq 0$.

In [13] the authors proved the following result.

Theorem 3. *Let x be a Sturmian word and let y be an infinite word such that for every n one has $p_x(n) = p_y(n)$ and $mf_x(n) = mf_y(n)$, i.e., a word having the same factor complexity and the same minimal forbidden factor complexity of x. Then, up to renaming letters, y is a Sturmian word having the same slope of x.*

Note that Theorem 2 is much stronger than Theorem 3, because in this latter the fact that y is a Sturmian word follows directly from the hypothesis that y has the same factor complexity as x.

Indeed, the cyclic complexity is more fine than the minimal factor complexity. Let x be an infinite binary word which avoids 11 and 000, and y an infinite binary word which avoids 11 and 101. Then x and y have the same minimal forbidden factor complexity ($mf_x(2) = mf_y(2) = 1$, $mf_x(3) = mf_y(3) = 1$ and $mf_x(n) = mf_y(n) = 0$ for $n > 3$), but it is readily checked that $c_x(5) = 3$ while $c_y(5) = 4$. Note that x contains 7 factors of length 5 corresponding to 3 cyclic classes $(00100, 00101, 01001, 10010, 10100, 10101)$ while y contains the factors $00000, 10000, 10010, 10001$ no two of which are cyclically conjugate.

5 Conclusions and further developments

We introduced a new measure of complexity of words, cyclic complexity. We showed that for this measure of complexity the Morse-Hedlund theorem can be extended, that is, a word is ultimately periodic if and only if it has bounded cyclic complexity (Theorem 1). The aperiodic words with minimal cyclic complexity can be defined as those having exactly 2 conjugacy classes of factors of length n for infinitely many values of n. Among these we have Sturmian words (which are the aperiodic words with minimal factor complexity), but we also exhibited a non-Sturmian example which, however, is a morphic image of a Sturmian word. We leave as an open problem that of characterizing the aperiodic words with minimal cyclic complexity.

Contrarily to other measures of complexity, cyclic complexity characterizes the language of a Sturmian word, in the sense that two Sturmian words with

different languages of factors have different cyclic complexities. More precisely, we proved that a word having the same cyclic complexity of a Sturmian word must be Sturmian and with the same slope (Theorem 2). A natural question is therefore the following: given two infinite words x and y with the same cyclic complexity, what can we say about their language of factors?

First, there exist two periodic words having same cyclic complexity but whose languages of factors are not isomorphic nor related by mirror image. For example, let τ be the morphism: $0 \mapsto 010$, $1 \mapsto 011$, and consider the words $x = \tau((010011)^\omega)$ and $x' = \tau((101100)^\omega)$. One can verify that x and x' have the same cyclic complexity up to length 17, and since each has period 18, the cyclic complexities agree.

Furthermore, it is easy to show that even two aperiodic words can have same cyclic complexity but different languages of factors. For example, let x be an infinite binary word avoiding 000111, and y an infinite binary word avoiding 001111. Then the languages of factors of x and y are not isomorphic, nor related by mirror image, yet the two words have the same cyclic complexity. However, we do not know if this can still happen with the additional hypothesis of linear complexity.

In every case, these examples show that cyclic complexity does not determine, in general, the language of factors. So, our Theorem 2 is very special to Sturmian words.

As a final remark, we want to point out that factor complexity, abelian complexity, and cyclic complexity can all be viewed as actions of different subgroups of the symmetric group on the indices of a finite word (respectively, the trivial subgroup, the whole symmetric group and the cyclic group). This point of view can lead to a structured analysis of the different measures of complexity induced by the permutations, by means of classical mathematical tools adapted to this new framework.

In conclusion, we believe that the new notion of complexity we introduced in this paper, cyclic complexity, can open new perspectives in the study of complexity of words and languages. A more comprehensive study of the mathematical aspects of this new theory will be developed in the full version of the paper.

References

1. J. Berstel. Sturmian and episturmian words (a survey of some recent results). In *Algebraic Informatics, Second International Conference, CAI 2007*, volume 4728 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 23–47. Springer, 2007.
2. J. Berstel, A. Lauve, C. Reutenauer, and F. Saliola. *Combinatorics on Words: Christoffel Words and Repetition in Words*, volume 27 of *CRM monograph series*. American Mathematical Society, 2008.
3. F. Blanchet-Sadri and N. Fox. On the asymptotic abelian complexity of morphic words. In *Developments in Language Theory, 17th International Conference, DLT 2013*, volume 7907 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 94–105. Springer, 2013.

4. J.-P. Borel and C. Reutenauer. On Christoffel classes. *RAIRO Theor. Inform. Appl.*, 40(1):15–27, 2006.
5. S. Brlek, S. Hamel, M. Nivat, and C. Reutenauer. On the palindromic complexity of infinite words. *Internat. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 15(2):293–306, 2004.
6. O. Jenkinson and L. Q. Zamboni. Characterisations of balanced words via orderings. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 310(1-3):247–271, 2004.
7. T. Kamae and L. Zamboni. Maximal pattern complexity for discrete systems. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 22(4):1201–1214, 2002.
8. J. Karhumäki, A. Saarela, and L. Q. Zamboni. On a generalization of abelian equivalence and complexity of infinite words. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, 120(8):2189–2206, 2013.
9. M. Lothaire. *Algebraic Combinatorics on Words*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2002.
10. B. Madill and N. Rampersad. The abelian complexity of the paperfolding word. *Discrete Math.*, 313(7):831–838, 2013.
11. S. Mantaci, A. Restivo, and M. Sciortino. Burrows-Wheeler transform and Sturmian words. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 86(5):241–246, 2003.
12. F. Mignosi and A. Restivo. A new complexity function for words based on periodicity. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 23(4):963–988, 2013.
13. F. Mignosi, A. Restivo, and M. Sciortino. Words and forbidden factors. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 273(1-2):99–117, 2002.
14. M. Morse and G. A. Hedlund. Symbolic dynamics. *Amer. J. Math.*, 60:1–42, 1938.
15. N. Pytheas Fogg. *Substitutions in Dynamics, Arithmetics and Combinatorics*, volume 1794 of *Lecture Notes in Math.* Springer, 2002.
16. G. Richomme, K. Saari, and L. Zamboni. Abelian complexity of minimal subshifts. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 83(1):79–95, 2011.
17. M. Rigo and P. Salimov. Another generalization of abelian equivalence: Binomial complexity of infinite words. In *Combinatorics on Words, 9th International Conference, WORDS 2013*, volume 8079 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 217–228. Springer, 2013.
18. A. Saarela. Ultimately constant abelian complexity of infinite words. *J. Autom. Lang. Comb.*, 14(3-4):255–?258, 2010.
19. O. Turek. Abelian complexity and abelian co-decomposition. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 469:77–91, 2013.